

**Safety Review Committee
September 16, 2005
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Ager, Joel W.	Materials Sciences Division	X
Banda, Michael J.	Computing Sciences Directorate	X
Bercovitz, John H.	Mechanical Safety Subcommittee	X
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	X
Feinberg, Benedict	Advanced Light Source Division	X
Fletcher, Kenneth A.	Facilities Department	
Hugenholtz, Phil	Genomics Division	X
Kadel, Richard W.	Physics Division	X
Kennedy, Burton Mack	Earth Sciences Division	X
Lucas, Donald	Environmental Energy Technologies Division	X
Macchiavelli, Augusto O.	Nuclear Science Division	
Mueller, Robert	Electrical Safety Subcommittee	
Ramorino, Karen B.	Directorate/OCFO/Human Resources	
Rao, Linfeng	Chemical Sciences Division	
Schoenlein, Robert W.	Laser Safety Subcommittee	
Seidl, Peter A.	Accelerator & Fusion Research Division	
Smith, Linda K.	Emergency Preparedness Safety Subcommittee	X
Taylor, Scott E.	Life Sciences Division	X
Thomas, Patricia M.	Safety Review Committee Secretary	X
Wong, Weyland	Engineering Division	
Yokota, Hisao A.	Physical Biosciences Division	

Others Present

Richard DeBusk, Matt Kotowski, Eugene Lau, Phyllis Pei, Pat Thomas, John Seabury, Hattie Carwell

CLOSED SESSION

Contract Negotiation Update – Phyllis Pei/Eugene Lau

OPEN SESSION

Chairman's Comments – Don Lucas

The minutes of the August meeting were accepted.

Don is continuing to work on charters with the subcommittees. The Safety Coordinators' Committee and Traffic Safety Committee may become subcommittees of the SRC. The

Institutional Biosafety Committee will remain independent from the SRC. Phyllis Pei will provide an updated chart of LBNL committees.

MESH Status

- Life Sciences report is complete.
- EH&S and Genomics reports are in factual accuracy review.
- Computing Sciences report is being written.
- Directorate review is scheduled to begin September 26.

Changes to PUB-3000, Chapter 6 AHD Hazard Reviews – John Seabury

In 2003, there was a Best Practices Review that recommended 10 corrective actions, 8 of which were completed. The remaining two were (1) describe “trigger levels” for work authorizations and (2) consider risk when evaluating hazards. The trigger levels have been added to PUB-3000, Chapter 6, Appendices A-C. John added regulatory references with links, where possible. The second corrective action is due by September 30, 2005. When doing a hazard assessment, the mitigation chosen should be commensurate with the risk. When writing an Activity Hazard Document, the Principal Investigator should either assume the risk of a hazard is significant and mitigate it, or do a formal risk assessment following standard procedures. The risk assessment procedures are contained in the AHD template as an option. A risk should be assumed to be “significant” if it is greater than the risk the public would generally see. Normal use of consumer chemical products would generally not be considered significant risks. A sentence could be added to existing AHDs at renewal that would state that the risks described were assumed to be significant. It was suggested that this could be added as a check box on the AHD signature form.

The SRC concurred with these changes to PUB-3000, Chapter 6 by general affirmation (no formal vote).

New Regulations (10 CFR 851) – Richard DeBusk

DOE has been criticized by Congress for self-regulation and lax enforcement of safety over the last 20 years. Congress is pushing DOE to develop regulations for worker health and safety programs. A first draft was developed in 2003 and a second draft was published in January 2005 for public comment. Extensive comments were received. The final regulations are expected to be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget by September 28. OMB is required to do a cost/benefit analysis. We expect the final rule to be published by December 28, 2005.

We haven’t seen the final version, but we have some ideas about what might be in it, based on earlier drafts and questions being asked about the cost to comply. We are working with LLNL to plan for compliance. The regulations are expected to mandate a worker health and safety program based on DOE Order 440.1A, OSHA regulations in 29 CFR 1910 and 1926, and some national standards (ANSI, ASME, NFPA). We don’t

know whether the National Building Code will be included. Radiological hazards will be excluded. The health and safety program will be required to contain specific elements, such as defining scope of work, identifying hazards, identifying worker exposures, etc. We will be required to submit our plan to DOE for approval by 180 days after the final regulation is published, which could make the due date June 2006 or sooner. The plan would have to be approved by DOE by September 28, 2006. We will not be allowed to continue to operate without an approved plan.

Enforcement of the regulation is expected to be similar to Price Anderson. We will be expected to self-report violations in real time and track corrective actions. Penalties are greater for any violations that were not self-reported. There was no definition of de minimis events in the draft regulations. There will be an implementation manual that will contain more detailed guidance. The elements of the Health and Safety Plan will be enforceable under the regulation, so the plan must be written carefully, similar to the 10 CFR 835 radiological plan. We expect to be required to do an annual program review.

The regulations were intended to be zero cost; however, we expect our actual cost of compliance to be about \$1.5 – 2 million per year. The regulations may require an electronic medical record system, which would cost about \$100K to develop. Our General Counsel will need to review medical record confidentiality issues. The medical record requirement is controversial and may be deferred until 2007.

Accident Statistics – Matt Kotowski

Our accident rates for this year are higher than last year and will exceed the DOE goals. We expect to finish in the “yellow” range. The goals get tougher every year, and it is not statistically possible for all Office of Science labs to make the 2007 goal of being in the top 10% of similar research facilities. Savannah River has the lowest rate at .19. Non-Compliance Acceptance Reports for hazardous waste and radiation violations are also part of our contract performance measures.

Brad Effron from Stanford analyzed the rate of events versus hours worked over the last ten years. Last year’s accident rate was unusually low. It corresponded with a reduction in activities at Facilities and Engineering. The long-term trend shows the Total Recordable Case and Days Away, Restricted, or Transferred rates have bottomed out. Administrative Services Division employees have been absorbed into their matrix divisions and this will affect the accident rate for research divisions. DOE is only interested in the number of accidents for the total site. Accident statistics are being posted on the EH&S website.

We need to look at the root causes of our accidents. Ergonomics and material handling continue to be the main issues. To reduce accidents, we should work on improving the mentoring and training of students and new employees. Outside contractors are a significant factor in our accident rate. To reduce the severity of ergonomic injuries, we need to encourage people to report symptoms early. Many people don’t realize that asking for first aid is not a reportable accident so they are reluctant to go to Health

Services. The importance of early reporting should be stressed in the supervisor training classes. We need to improve our overall safety culture and target the higher risk activities (engineering, construction, facilities) for special attention.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary